

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 10, 15, and 18 are amended. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 6, lines 13-26 and page 7, line 2 to page 8, line 13 of the specification. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to because of informalities. The specification has been amended to correct the informalities. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Cross Reference To Related Application(s)

With regard to the objection to the cross reference to related application incorporated in the specification, Applicants point out that U.S. patent application serial No. 09/800,316, entitled "SERVICE CONTROL MANAGER TOOL DEFINITION," and filed on March 6, 2001, remains pending and there has not been a change in the status of this application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the cross reference to related applications.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 10 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 18 have been amended to more clearly recite the features of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims are read in light of the specification. The specification clearly provides that the nodes are managed by the SCM module, the SCM module executes commands that are encapsulated within a tool (see page 3, lines 1-10), and the tool executes commands on target nodes (see page 4, lines 23-26). With respect to claim 9, individual target status is created by the DTF and described in detail at, for example, page 11, line 13 to page 13, line 16 of the specification.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,148,323 to Whitner et al. (hereafter Whitner). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Whitner is directed to a system and method for managing the execution of system management using a task manager. However, Whitner does not disclose or suggest "the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model, and wherein the roles define which management functions a user can perform on the one or more nodes associated with the SCM module; checking if the user is authorized for one of the roles associated with the tool on all of the nodes, wherein the user assigned with one of the roles on

all of the nodes is authorized to run the tool,” as recited in amended claim 1. Whitner does not teach or suggest the use of roles, and certainly does not teach or suggest the feature of using roles to determine if a user is authorized to run a tool at a node. Since Whitner does not disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 4, 6-12, and 14 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 15, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Whitner does not disclose or suggest “the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model, wherein the roles define which management functions a user can perform on the one or more nodes associated with the SCM module, wherein the SCM module checks if the user is authorized for one of the roles associated with the tool on all of the nodes, wherein the user assigned with one of the roles on all of the nodes is authorized to run the tool,” as recited in amended claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16-17 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 18, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Whitner does not disclose or suggest “the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model, and wherein the roles define which management functions a user can perform on the one or more nodes associated with the SCM module; checking if the user is authorized for one of the roles associated with the tool on all of the nodes, wherein the user assigned with one of the roles on all of the nodes is authorized to run the tool,” as recited in amended claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is allowable.

Claims 19-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 18 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitner in view of U.S. Patent 5,455,953 to Russell (hereafter Russell). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Russell is directed to an authorization system for obtaining in single step both identification and access rights of client to server directly from encrypted authorization ticket. However, Russell does not cure Whitner’s defect and does not teach or disclose the feature of using roles to determine if a user is authorized to run a tool at a node, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Whitner and Russell.

Claim 3 is allowable because it depends from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitner in view of U.S. Patent 6,412,008 to Fields et al. (hereafter Fields). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Fields is directed to a system and method for cooperative client/server customization of web pages. However, Fields does not cure Whitner's defect and does not teach or disclose the feature of using roles to determine if a user is authorized to run a tool at a node, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Whitner and Fields.

Claim 5 is allowable because it depends from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitner in view of U.S. Patent 5,175,800 to Galis et al. (hereafter Galis). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Galis is directed to an expert and data base system and method for communications network. However, Galis does not cure Whitner's defect and does not teach or disclose the feature of using roles to determine if a user is authorized to run a tool at a node, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Whitner and Galis.


Claims 2 and 13 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2004



Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739